

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

RICKY M. ARNTSEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:24-CV-5511-BHS-DWC

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR  
EXTENSION AND STRIKING  
RESPONSE

On February 14, 2025, Defendants State of Washington Department of Corrections, Steven Sinclair, Cheryl Strange, Jeri Boe, Danielle Armbruster, Paul Clark, J. Scott Edwards, Linda Ineman, Rhonda Stump, Shane Evans, Jay Jackson, Ron Haynes, Jason Bennett, Annikaa Mizin, Jeff Tatro, and Patrick Collecchi (“State Defendants”)<sup>1</sup> filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. Dkt. 90. After Plaintiff was granted an extension of time, he was directed to file his response to the Motion for Summary Judgment on or before April 4, 2025. *See* Dkt. 105. On March 28, 2025, Plaintiff filed a second motion for extension of time to file the response,

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant Byd Surgical Masks Manufacturer has not yet appeared in the case and Defendant Honeywell Surgical Masks Manufacturer filed an answer on March 31, 2025.

1 wherein Plaintiff requests a 45-day extension to file his response to the Motion for Summary  
2 Judgment Dkt. 107. The Motion for Extension of Time is currently noted for this Court's  
3 consideration on April 18, 2025. Dkt. 107.

4 On April 9, 2025, Plaintiff filed his response to the Motion for Summary Judgment. Dkt.  
5 111. The Response is 60 pages and contains both his response to the Motion for Summary  
6 Judgment and a declaration in support of the Response. *See id.* In addition, Plaintiff filed 500  
7 pages of exhibits. Dkt. 111-1 – Dkt. 111-6. Plaintiff also filed 430 pages of exhibits on April 7,  
8 2025. *See* Dkt. 110.

9 The Court finds Plaintiff's Response fails to comply with the Local Civil Rules ("LCR").  
10 A response to a motion for summary judgment cannot exceed twenty-four (24) pages. LCR 7(e).  
11 Plaintiff's response is 60 pages, and Plaintiff did not seek leave to file an over-length brief. *See*  
12 Dkt. 111. Rather than decline to consider the additional pages, the Court directs Plaintiff to file a  
13 response that complies with the LCR 7.

14 Accordingly, the Court grants Plaintiff's Motion for Extension (Dkt. 107) as follows:  
15 Plaintiff's Response, filed on April 9, 2025, is deemed timely filed. However, because his  
16 Response does not comply with the LCRs, the Response is stricken.

17 Plaintiff is directed to file a renewed response to the pending Motion for Summary  
18 Judgment on or before June 9, 2025. The response shall not exceed 24 pages. In addition,  
19 Plaintiff's declaration shall not be combined with his response but shall be filed separately. As  
20 Plaintiff has filed nearly 1000 pages of exhibits, the Court advises Plaintiff that the Court is only  
21 required to consider materials cited to in the briefs. As such, Plaintiff is directed to only file  
22 documents that are necessary to support his response to the Motion for Summary Judgment. The  
23 State Defendants' optional reply must be filed on or before June 16, 2025.

1 The Clerk's Office is directed to strike Plaintiff's Response (Dkt. 111) and re-note the  
2 State Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 90) to June 16, 2025.

3 Dated this 10th day of April, 2025.

4 

5 \_\_\_\_\_  
6 David W. Christel  
7 United States Magistrate Judge  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24